

PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD'S DECISION

APPELLANT: A. Laskaris
DOCKET NO.: 04-22820.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 14-19-231-017-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are A. Laskaris, the appellant, by attorney Mary T. Nicolau of Smith Davies & Nicolau, Chicago, and the Cook County Board of Review.

The subject property consists of a 3,125 square foot parcel improved with a 90-year-old, two-story style multi-family dwelling of masonry construction containing 2,392 square feet of living area (Improvement One) located in Lake View Township, Cook County. The subject improvement contains two apartments and has a basement. The record also revealed the subject parcel is improved with a 117-year-old two-story single-family dwelling of frame and masonry construction containing 1,280 square feet of living area (Improvement Two.) This dwelling contains on full bath and has a full basement.

The appellant, through counsel, submitted evidence before the Property Tax Appeal Board claiming unequal treatment in the assessment process as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant offered data detailing four suggested comparable properties located in the same coded assessment neighborhood as the subject. These properties consist of two-story style multi-family dwellings of masonry or frame construction from 65 to 100 years old. All of the comparable dwellings contain two apartments; three have basement; three have garages, one has fireplaces and one has air conditioning. The comparables range in size from 2,208 to 2,788 square feet of living area and have improvement assessments ranging from \$15.58 to \$16.29 per square foot of living area. A copy of the subject's 2004 board of review final decision was also included. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's improvement assessment.

(Continued on Next Page)

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds no change in the assessment of the property as established by the Cook County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND:	\$	4,800
IMPR.:	\$	60,073
TOTAL:	\$	64,873

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's final improvement assessment of \$60,073 was disclosed. Of this figure, \$37,131 or \$11.34 per square foot of living area is allocated to Improvement One and \$22,942 or \$17.94 per square foot of living area is allocated to improvement Two. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review offered property characteristic sheets and spreadsheets detailing eight suggested comparable properties located within the same coded assessment neighborhood as the subject.

The improvement comparables consist of four two-story multi-family dwellings and four single family dwellings. The comparables are of frame, masonry or frame and masonry construction from 100 to 125 years old. Four of the comparables contain two apartments each; seven have basements; three have air conditioning; two have fireplaces; and six have garages. These dwellings range in size from 1,440 to 2,988 square feet of living area and have improvement assessments ranging from \$15.93 to \$30.38 per square of living area. Based on the foregoing evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of its assessment.

After reviewing the record and considering the evidence, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal. The appellant's argument was unequal treatment in the assessment process. The Illinois Supreme Court has held that taxpayers who object to an assessment on the basis of lack of uniformity bear the burden of proving the disparity of assessment valuations by clear and convincing evidence. Kankakee County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 131 Ill.2d 1 (1989). The evidence must demonstrate a consistent pattern of assessment inequities within the assessment jurisdiction. After an analysis of the assessment data, the Board finds the appellant has not overcome this burden.

IMPROVEMENT ONE

The Property Tax Appeal Board finds that the parties submitted eight properties as comparable to the subject's Improvement One. The Board accords the appellant's comparables and the board of reviewed comparable number one the most weight. These improvements bear similarities to the subject in location, size, age, and amenities. Therefore, the Board finds that these properties are the most similar to Improvement One in the record. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$15.58 to \$16.29 per square foot of living area. The subject has an improvement assessment of \$15.52 per square foot of living area is slightly below the range established by the improvements found the most similar. The Board accords the remaining properties little weight as these improvements differ, particularly in size,

when compared to the subject. Therefore, the Property Tax Appeal Board concludes that no reduction in Improvement One's assessment is warranted.

IMPROVEMENT TWO

The Property Tax Appeal Board finds that the parties submitted eight properties as comparable to the subject's Improvement Two. The Board accords the board of review's comparables numbered four through eight the most weight. These improvements bear similarities to the subject in location, age, and amenities. Therefore, the Board finds that these properties are the most similar to Improvement Two in the record. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$25.45 to \$30.38 per square foot of living area. The subject has an improvement assessment of \$17.92, which is below the range established by the improvements found the most similar. The Board accords the remaining properties little weight as these improvements differ particularly in size when compared to the subject. Therefore, the Property Tax Appeal Board concludes that no reduction in Improvement Two's improvement assessment is warranted.

As a result of this analysis, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds the appellant has not adequately demonstrated that the subject dwelling was inequitably assessed by clear and convincing evidence and no reduction is warranted.

This is a final administrative decision of the Property Tax Appeal Board which is subject to review in the Circuit Court or Appellate Court under the provisions of the Administrative Review Law (735 ILCS 5/3-101 et seq.) and section 16-195 of the Property Tax Code.



Chairman



Member



Member



Member



Member

DISSENTING: _____

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

As Clerk of the Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board and the keeper of the Records thereof, I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and complete Final Administrative Decision of the Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board issued this date in the above entitled appeal, now of record in this said office.

Date: April 25, 2008



Clerk of the Property Tax Appeal Board

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Section 16-185 of the Property Tax Code provides in part:

"If the Property Tax Appeal Board renders a decision lowering the assessment of a particular parcel after the deadline for filing

complaints with the Board of Review or after adjournment of the session of the Board of Review at which assessments for the subsequent year are being considered, the taxpayer may, within 30 days after the date of written notice of the Property Tax Appeal Board's decision, appeal the assessment for the subsequent year directly to the Property Tax Appeal Board."

In order to comply with the above provision, YOU MUST FILE A PETITION AND EVIDENCE WITH THE PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE ENCLOSED DECISION IN ORDER TO APPEAL THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPERTY FOR THE SUBSEQUENT YEAR.

Based upon the issuance of a lowered assessment by the Property Tax Appeal Board, the refund of paid property taxes is the responsibility of your County Treasurer. Please contact that office with any questions you may have regarding the refund of paid property taxes.